UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : CASE NO. 1:25-cr-64

.

Plaintiff, : JUDGE: Cole

:

v. : <u>INFORMATION</u>

18 U.S.C. § 1343

JOHN J. KERSEY, :

FORFEITURE

Defendant. :

THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY CHARGES:

COUNT 1 (WIRE FRAUD)

At all times relevant:

- 1. The defendant, **JOHN J. KERSEY** ("KERSEY"), resided in the Southern District of Ohio.
- 2. **KERSEY** was a registered broker, investment adviser, and insurance agent. **KERSEY** had worked in financial industry for more than thirty-five years.
- 3. **KERSEY** worked for Company A for more than twenty years, as an agent. Company A prohibited **KERSEY** from serving as trustee or power of attorney for his clients.

The Scheme to Defraud

4. Beginning in or about 2003 through 2023, in the Southern District of Ohio and elsewhere, the defendant, **JOHN J. KERSEY**, perpetrated a scheme to defraud his clients by soliciting millions of dollars for purported investments, then failing to invest client's funds as

promised, and misappropriating and converting client's funds to **KERSEY's** own benefit without the knowledge or authorization of his clients, using interstate wire communications to execute the scheme to defraud.

- 5. At times, **KERSEY** persuaded his clients to move their existing investments from Company A to purportedly invest in other funds or with other companies. By moving his clients' funds away from Company A, **KERSEY** concealed his scheme from Company A, and thus the visibility of his theft.
- 6. For example, **KERSEY** convinced some clients to move their investments out of Company A into a purported Guaranteed Investment Account (GIA) that would yield returns of 5-5.5%. To add legitimacy to the move, **KERSEY** provided his clients with a summary explaining how the GIA worked. According to **KERSEY**, the money would be divided into tranches, with each tranche invested in buffered notes that offered the promised yield and guaranteed the principal.
- 7. To effectuate the transfer, **KERSEY's** clients liquidated their investments with Company A, and transferred those funds to their bank accounts. **KERSEY** then instructed his clients to write personal checks to **KERSEY** for the new investments. To make his request appear more legitimate to the client, **KERSEY** instructed clients to write the word, "Trustee" after his name. However, **KERSEY** was not acting as a trustee; rather, he was stealing his clients' funds. **KERSEY** deposited the personal checks into accounts he controlled and did not invest his clients' funds as promised.
- 8. Other times, to effectuate the transfer of funds, **KERSEY** requested that clients provide him with signed blank checks so he could purportedly move the money from aggressive investment accounts to more conservative investment accounts. However,

KERSEY did not use the blank checks to invest client funds into other investments accounts; **KERSEY** filled out the checks and deposited them into his own account.

- 9. **KERSEY** kept his scheme afloat by persuading existing customers to continue to invest through him. For example, via telephone and text messages, **KERSEY** told existing clients about new investment opportunities. **KERSEY** created a false sense of urgency for these investments, telling clients that these opportunities were only available for a few days. **KERSEY** would follow his pitch with text messages containing wiring instructions not to any investment or trustee account, but to his personal account. By wiring the money to directly to **KERSEY's** bank account, **KERSEY** concealed the transaction and his activities from Company A.
- 10. To induce current clients to keep investing, and thus conceal his fraudulent scheme, **KERSEY** told his clients that their investments were performing well. **KERSEY** created false documents that he would provide or show to his clients. For example, **KERSEY** gave clients fictious summaries purporting to depict their investments, or account balance statements with fictitious amounts and fake account numbers. At times **KERSEY** also fabricated charts and graphs to show clients their supposed investment gains. These documents were all false, as **KERSEY** had not invested the clients' money. Rather, he deposited his client's money into his own accounts.
- 11. **KERSEY** took more than \$8 million from his clients. Rather than invest the money as promised, **KERSEY** deposited client's money in his personal account or in an account that benefitted **KERSEY**. **KERSEY** then used the money for his personal benefit to pay down credit card bills, pay insurance premiums and to provide a downpayment on real

estate. **KERSEY** also used the money to pay other clients, when required to do so in order to maintain his investment scheme.

Execution of the Scheme to Defraud

On or about July 14, 2023, in the Southern District of Ohio, the defendant, **JOHN J. KERSEY**, for the purpose of executing the scheme to defraud described above, did knowingly cause the use of interstate wire transfer, to wit, the wiring of funds in the amount of \$100,000 from the bank account of an investor to **KERSEY's** personal bank account, after **KERSEY** deposited the clients' check into his own personal bank account.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343.

FORFEITURE ALLEGATION

Upon conviction of the offense set forth in Count 1 of this Information, the defendant, **JOHN J. KERSEY**, shall forfeit to the United States, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), any property, real or personal, which constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to the violation, including but not limited to:

- a. Contents of Fidelity Brokerage, Account Number ending in 8559, in the name of John Albert Kersey and in the approximate amount of \$100,000.00;
- b. Contents of Fifth Third Bank, Account Number ending in 9167, in the name of John A. Kersey and in the approximate amount of \$6,218.82; and
- c. Contents of Wilmington Savings Bank, Account Number ending in 7823, in the name of John J. Kersey or Lynne M. Kersey and in the approximate amount of \$4,167.43.

SUBSTITUTE ASSETS

If any of the property described above, as a result of any act or omission of the defendant:

- a. cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;
- b. has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third party;

- c. has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the court;
- d. has been substantially diminished in value; or
- e. has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided without difficulty,

it is the intent of the United States, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(p), as incorporated by 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), to seek forfeiture of any other property of the defendant, up to the value of the property described above.

KELLY A. NORRIS

ACTING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

EMILY N. GLATFELTER

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY